Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,549	GRAHAM, ROBERT G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	N. Bhat	1764	
All Participants:	Status of Application: Per	<u>nding</u>	
(1) <u>N. Bhat</u> .	(3)		
(2) R. McKellar.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 22 February 2007	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: .	cant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: See Continuation Sheet			
Claims discussed: 1 only			
Prior art documents discussed: Cordell et al. in combination with Williams et al.			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	3 DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summa 	ne examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	nt/Applicant's Representative Si	ignature – if appr	onriate)
(Applican	ivapplicant's Representative Si	gnature - ir appro	οριιαί <i>ο)</i>

Continuation of rejections discussed: 112, 2nd paragraph rejection as well as obviousness rejection over cited prior art .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Although prior art doesn't teach individually controlled burn areas, the claim as drafted does not teach how the modular design itself is individually controlled. The examiner suggested and was agreed to by applicant to include the limitations of claim 7 into claim 1 which teaches exactly how each modular cell is individually controlled to overcome the obviousness rejection as well as the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection.